



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1970

No. 17

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Jerry McAndrews, S.J., superior at Loyola College, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, for those who have accepted freely the awesome responsibility of framing the laws of this Nation, we offer this prayer.

Let them remember that law serves to promote freedom, to give aid to the weak, to protect the innocent, to restrain the strong, to punish the guilty, and most important, it serves to unite Your people.

Let them not forget that all authority comes from You and that all just laws imitate and express Your will.

It is a will that creates rather than destroys; that is both just and merciful; that issues commands yet shows patience.

Finally, let them remember that lawmakers are peacemakers, and that the fruit of justice is sown in peace by those who practice peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 5, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as to provide for an independent Federal agency for the supervision of federally chartered credit unions, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced the Senate insists upon its amendments to the

bill (H.R. 13300) entitled "An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EGGLETON, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SMITH of Illinois, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14733) entitled "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of assistance for health services for domestic migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. EGGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PRUTTY, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a compilation of the hearings, reports, and committee prints of the Senate Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations entitled "Planning-Programming-Budgeting."

THE LATE HONORABLE BEN FRANKLIN JENSEN

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) is recognized.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the Speaker and the Members of the House of the death of one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Ben Franklin Jensen. Ben, who represented the Seventh District of Iowa for 26 uninterrupted years, from 1939 to 1964, was stricken by cancer at the age of 77, and passed away here in Washing-

ton at the George Washington University Hospital on February 4.

Ben was the mentor and guide of my political life, and I looked on him as a second father. I worked under him as county chairman when he served in Congress, and it was with his blessing that I ran for his seat in 1966. His wise counsel and unfailing support will be sorely missed.

He is survived by his wife of 53 years, the former Charlotte Hadden, and a daughter, Mrs. Donald Fitzpatrick, of Marblehead, Mass. He also leaves two sisters, a brother, five grandchildren, and a great-grandchild. On behalf of the Speaker and the Members of the House, I extend to all of them our deepest regret and sympathy.

Funeral services will be held Tuesday, February 10, at Exira, Iowa, where he will be buried.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent for a special order to be held at the close of business Tuesday, February 17, for the purpose of eulogizing our former colleague. During that hour, all those who wish to may join in paying tribute to Ben Franklin Jensen.

This country has lost a great American.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I am happy to yield to my distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of our former colleague from Iowa, a dear and valued friend of mine, Hon. Ben F. Jensen.

During his period of service in the House of Representatives from 1939 to 1965, Ben Jensen was a hard-working and dedicated Member. He was also one of the most colorful Members of the House. In debate, in discussing the issue, or issues, involved in a pending bill or matter, he expressed his thoughts and views in a direct and distinct manner.

Ben, as he was called with affection, was possessed of those rich qualities of life that makes up a nobility of character.

To those who enjoyed and possessed the friendship of Ben Jensen—they had a real friend, not one who was a surface, a wavering, or an expedient friend.

H 689

He was one of the Members who was wounded on March 1, 1954, when a militant group from Puerto Rico shot deliberately and recklessly at Members of the House then present, supposedly to dramatize the cause of Puerto Rican independence.

After his recovery from his wounds, and upon his return to the House, Ben Jensen told his colleagues, "No one can blame the people of Puerto Rico." This is an excellent example of the bigness of Ben Jensen.

It can be truly said of Ben Jensen that he was a great American, a dedicated legislator, and whose love of his fellow human beings, without regard to race, color, or creed, was evidenced during his lifetime in and out of the Halls of Congress.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. Jensen and her daughter, and other loved ones, our deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my distinguished minority floor leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Ben Jensen was a dear friend of mine. I join the gentleman from Iowa and the distinguished Speaker in expressing to Ben's family the deepest condolences of Mrs. Ford and myself.

It was my privilege for a number of years to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with Ben Jensen. He was a strong man on the committee. He was truly devoted to the responsibilities that he held on that important committee.

He was a man of convictions, and yet he was a man of compassion. He not only did what he thought was right, but also he would fight on the floor of this House for those issues and those views that he held so strongly.

It was my privilege also to know Ben socially and he was a delightful person. On many occasions I have talked with him, discussed matters with him not in a legislative way but from the point of view of what his views were and mine on the major problems that faced this country.

I had great admiration and respect for Ben Jensen and he had as many such friends on both sides of the aisle.

I was sorry to see Ben leave the House of Representatives. However, typical of Ben, he maintained a deep interest in community affairs and was a frequent visitor to the Capitol and to this Chamber where he was always welcome. Ben Jensen wrote a fine, outstanding record in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate and re-emphasize the loss of this country in a great citizen and a superb legislator, Ben Jensen.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SCHERLE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Ben Jensen was a colleague whom I admired and a friend I loved. In his bearing and attitude he represented the rugged Iowa soil from which he came. He was independent, strong, forthright, honest, and able. I saw him only a short time ago when he paid a visit to the Capitol. We had quite

a long chat. He had lost some of the physical strength that characterized his appearance here on the floor, but he still had the old Ben Jensen spirit. He was truly an individual; he was different; he did not fit in a mold. He was a great man and a great Congressman. I have lost a real friend and the country has lost an outstanding servant.

I join with the gentleman from Iowa in extending to his loved ones my very deepest sympathy.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I now yield to my colleague from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that one who has been closely associated with Ben Jensen might say at a time like this, always beginning with the fact that he was a strong man and a Christian family man. Less well known to many Members is the fact that he was a creative individual, an inventor of a number of very useful things, and an artist as well, spending considerable time in his later years as a sculptor. Most important, I think, is the fact that the House of Representatives was Ben Jensen's life. To that institution he was completely dedicated. Although he was known throughout his political career as a conservative, Ben from the beginning of his days in Congress and especially as a member of the Committee on Appropriations was indeed one of the leaders in resource development and conservation. In this Ben Jensen was a great leader and in this effort he will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Iowa for those kind words.

I deeply appreciate the generous comments and remarks of the Speaker of the House as well as the distinguished majority leader and my distinguished minority floor leader, as well as those of other Members. I will convey the messages to the survivors with deep respect and appreciation from all of the Members.

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BINGHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HEARINGS SET BY COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

(Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 I introduced, with the sponsorship of all members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, a resolution to amend the present requirements of House rule XLIV on financial disclosure.

The resolution was referred to our committee and I rise today to let mem-

bers know that the committee has scheduled public hearings on the resolution to open Thursday, February 19, in the committee room, 2360 Rayburn Building.

The committee invites the views of Members of the House on the resolution and requests that you advise the committee staff if you desire to testify in person. If you prefer to submit a statement, rather than appear, simply forward it to the committee so that it may be included in the record.

The committee welcomes also the views of other interested persons who may desire to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will recall that when our committee submitted the present financial disclosure rule, it emphasized that experience probably would indicate the need for revision.

In the committee's view, the time has arrived for making the changes proposed in the pending resolution. Our committee is unanimous in support of the proposed changes. It believes they are needed to strengthen the disclosure requirements.

The revision we recommend would require public disclosure: first, of the sources of honoraria of \$300 or more; and, second, of the sources of loans of \$10,000 or more for which no specific security was pledged and which were outstanding for 90 days or more in the calendar year covered.

The committee is hopeful that the hearings will develop a broad base of opinion concerning the provisions of House Resolution 796. Please advise the committee staff if you desire to be heard or submit a statement.

PROPOSED NEW OFFICE OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY IN THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-222)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States: which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

We live in a time when the technology of telecommunications is undergoing rapid change which will dramatically affect the whole of our society. It has long been recognized that the executive branch of the Federal government should be better equipped to deal with the issues which arise from telecommunications growth. As the largest single user of the nation's telecommunications facilities, the Federal government must also manage its internal communications operations in the most effective manner possible.

Accordingly, I am today transmitting to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1970, prepared in accordance with chapter 9 of title 5 of the United States Code.

That plan would establish a new Office of Telecommunications Policy in the Executive Office of the President. The

new unit would be headed by a Director and a Deputy Director who would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The existing office held by the Director of Telecommunications Management in the Office of Emergency Preparedness would be abolished.

In addition to the functions which are transferred to it by the reorganization plan, the new Office would perform certain other duties which I intend to assign to it by Executive order as soon as the reorganization plan takes effect. That order would delegate to the new Office essentially those functions which are now assigned to the Director of Telecommunications Management. The Office of Telecommunications Policy would be assisted in its research and analysis responsibilities by the agencies and departments of the Executive Branch including another new office, located in the Department of Commerce.

The new Office of Telecommunications Policy would play three essential roles:

1. It would serve as the President's principal adviser on telecommunications policy, helping to formulate government policies concerning a wide range of domestic and international telecommunications issues and helping to develop plans and programs which take full advantage of the nation's technological capabilities. The speed of economic and technological advance in our time means that new questions concerning communications are constantly arising, questions on which the government must be well informed and well advised. The new Office will enable the President and all government officials to share more fully in the experience, the insights, and the forecasts of government and non-government experts.

2. The Office of Telecommunications Policy would help formulate policies and coordinate operations for the Federal government's own vast communications systems. It would, for example, set guidelines for the various departments and agencies concerning their communications equipment and services. It would regularly review the ability of government communications systems to meet the security needs of the Nation and to perform effectively in time of emergency. The Office would direct the assignment of those portions of the radio spectrum which are reserved for government use, carry out responsibilities conferred on the President by the Communications Satellite Act, advise State and local governments, and provide policy direction for the National Communications System.

3. Finally, the new Office would enable the executive branch to speak with a clearer voice and to act as a more effective partner in discussions of communications policy with both the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission. This action would take away none of the prerogatives or functions assigned to the Federal Communications Commission by the Congress. It is my hope, however, that the new Office and the Federal Communications Commission would cooperate in achieving certain reforms in telecommunica-

tions policy, especially in their procedures for allocating portions of the radio spectrum for government and civilian use. Our current procedures must be more flexible if they are to deal adequately with problems such as the worsening spectrum shortage.

Each reorganization included in the plan which accompanies this message is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 901(a) of title 5 of the United States Code. In particular, the plan is responsive to section 901(a)(1), "to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;" and section 901(a)(3), "to increase the efficiency of the operations of the government to the fullest extent practicable."

The reorganizations provided for in this plan makes necessary the appointment and compensation of new officers, as specified in sections 3(a) and 3(b) of the plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are comparable to those fixed for other officers in the executive branch who have similar responsibilities.

This plan should result in the more efficient operation of the government. It is not practical, however, to itemize or aggregate the exact expenditure reductions which will result from this action.

The public interest requires that government policies concerning telecommunications be formulated with as much sophistication and vision as possible. This reorganization plan—and the executive order which would follow it—are necessary instruments if the government is to respond adequately to the challenges and opportunities presented by the rapid pace of change in communications. I urge that the Congress allow this plan to become effective so that these necessary reforms can be accomplished.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 1970.

EXEMPT POTATOES FOR PROCESSING FROM MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 817 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 817

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2214) to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 817 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of S. 2214 to exempt potatoes used for processing from marketing orders.

The purpose of S. 2214 is to exempt from the coverage of Federal marketing orders, for a period of 2 years following the date of enactment of this legislation, potatoes used for dehydrating, chipping, or other processing, and thereby affording these potatoes the same treatment provided potatoes used for canning and freezing.

At the present time the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended in 1946, provides an exemption for canning potatoes and freezing potatoes.

S. 2214 merely extends the same exemption to potatoes used in the dehydration process, a relatively new technique, which is growing in importance every year. Since the marketing order law has historically recognized the distinction between fresh agricultural commodities and those used for processing, the exemption being sought is no different from exemptions allowed under present law.

From the viewpoint of equity, too, the proposal cannot be denied, for the various methods of processing compete in business with each other. It is only fair that the same rules apply to all three processors. To deny dehydrators and other processors the exemption now enjoyed by canning and freezing processors would mean the continuing grant of an unfair advantage to the latter in their competition for the national market.

Although the Committee on Agriculture did not feel that the enactment of the bill would weaken marketing orders, an automatic review of the effect of the legislation was provided by the 2-year limit for this new exemption.

There is widespread grower support for this legislation, and the Committee report is explicit in stating that approval of this legislation does not establish a precedent for other products or for potatoes that are not processed.

A most welcome aspect of the proposed legislation is that its enactment will result in no added costs to the Government. In fact, it may mean some savings in Government expenditures because of the reduction in administrative services within the Department of Agriculture which is likely to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 817 in order that this House may consider and pass S. 2214, a bill which certainly is not a "hot potato."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to exempt from the

coverage of Federal marketing orders, potatoes used for dehydrating, chipping, or other processing operations.

Historically, Federal marketing order law has recognized the distinction between fresh agricultural commodities and those grown to be processed. With respect to potatoes, the original 1937 Marketing Agreement Act provided an exemption for potatoes to be used in canning. A further exemption for freezing was added in 1946 when that process was perfected. Now another exemption is needed to keep the industry up to date with dehydration and other newly perfected processes.

The exemption is for a 2-year period. The Department of Agriculture has advised that no increased cost to the Government will result from passage of this legislation; it is not too happy with the bill, believing it will reduce the effectiveness of marketing orders in view of the increasing quantities of potatoes going into exempted uses.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill—S. 2214—to exempt potatoes for processing from marketing orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 2214, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself whatever time I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, S. 2214 is needed to update the National Marketing Order Act of 1937 as it applies to potatoes. When the act was first passed, all fruits and vegetables for canning were exempt from marketing orders. The reason that only canning was mentioned was because canning was the only major method of preserving food at that time. In 1946, when freezing had become a major method of food preservation, the Marketing Order Act was amended to exempt all fruits and vegetables for canning or freezing from marketing orders.

Today, in the potato industry, we have chaos. Potatoes for canning and freezing

are exempt from marketing orders. But, potatoes for dehydration, potato shoestrings, and potato chips are subject to marketing orders. This chaos is increased by the fact that potatoes are grown throughout the United States. They are planted nearly every day somewhere in the country, and harvested everyday somewhere else in this great Nation. While Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Colorado have marketing orders, Maine, North Dakota, Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania, and other major potato producing areas do not have marketing orders.

The necessity for this bill was realized when a shoestring manufacturer in California was subjected to a marketing order for controlling the size of potatoes which he could purchase while his two major competitors in New York and Arkansas were not subject to marketing orders and similar controls.

Mr. Chairman, among my constituents is one of the truly great national potato chip companies. They manufacture and distribute potato chips and other snacks nationally. They have told me of the terrible difficulties and entanglements, the hardships to producers and consumers alike, that will result if their plants in some areas of the country are subjected to marketing order regulations that do not apply to their competitors who sell in the same markets. This bill will prevent this happening. This is a good bill that was carefully considered in the Agricultural Committees of both the Senate and the House. It passed the Senate by a voice vote and I urge my colleagues to vote for it here today. Thank you.

[Mr. PURCELL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURCELL. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington.

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. I would like to speak to the point raised by the gentleman from Iowa.

I might tell the gentleman that a great deal of concern was expressed by potato producer groups in certain parts of the country that this bill would weaken the effectiveness of marketing orders. Other producers of fruits and vegetables also testified against the bill on the basis of the fact that they felt this legislation would set a precedent that would weaken existing marketing orders on other commodities. Even the U.S. Department of Agriculture had some reservations in this respect and presented to our committee the views outlined in their letter on page 3 of our Agriculture Committee report.

So, although our committee does not feel that enactment of the bill would significantly reduce the effectiveness of marketing orders as a means of strengthening returns to the producers of various agricultural products that utilize marketing orders, we decided that in order to provide for automatic review of the effect of this exemption we should at this time approve only a 2-year bill. Then,

if our review reveals that marketing orders were, in fact, adversely affected by this legislation, we would have an opportunity to make needed corrections. If on the other hand, it becomes evident from the review that the legislation created no problems, we could look forward to making it permanent.

I wanted also during the course of this colloquy with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) to make this quite clear to some potato producer groups as well as other producers of fruits and vegetables who have this great concern about the bill as it is presently written.

Mr. PURCELL. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington for her comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which would set a uniform and consistent rule for all potato processors.

This bill, which has been approved by the Committee on Agriculture with only three dissenting votes, would exempt from the coverage of any Federal marketing order—for a period of 2 years following the date of enactment of this bill—potatoes used for dehydrating, chipping, or other processing. It would thereby give these particular potatoes the same treatment that the law now affords potatoes for canning or freezing which are presently exempt from the application of Federal marketing orders.

When we held the hearings on this legislation in the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, it became clear that the present law was discriminatory against dehydrators and other processors. Some processors—those purchasing potatoes for canning or freezing—are exempt from the Marketing Order Act, but other potato processors—those dehydrating potatoes, for example—were subject to the restrictions of volume, quality, timing, and other administrative regulations inherent in a marketing order.

This bill, then, simply would treat all potato processors the same—that is, it would exempt them from Federal orders.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) has pointed out, the 2-year life on the exemption provided under this bill will no doubt be extended. I did not feel we needed to put a 2-year life on the bill, but in order to allay the fears of some grower groups, the committee agreed to this compromise.

Personally, I can see little justification in the inclusion of any processor within the umbrella of a Federal marketing order for fruits and vegetables. The act itself through the years and since its adoption in 1937 has carefully confined its application to fresh fruits and vegetables. With only a few exceptions have processing crops been included. The action by the House, in approving this bill, would certainly be helpful in forming